

**Remarks**

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the subject application. Claims 1-8 and 17-26 remain pending.

5

**Statement of Substance of Examiner Interview dated 7/23/08**

Applicant would like to sincerely thank Examiner Augustine for his time in discussing this application over the phone with Applicant's attorney Daniel T. McGinnity on 7/23/08.

10

During this interview, the §102 rejections over Gershony were briefly discussed. In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, proposed amendments to clarify aspects of the claims were discussed. The Examiner provided helpful input on the proposed claims. The Applicant understood the Examiner as tentatively agreeing that the subject matter of the proposed amendments was sufficient overcome the art of record.

15

Accordingly, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein in the spirit of those discussed during the interview. The Applicant submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain that would prevent the allowance of the application, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issues.

20

### 35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-8 and 17-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent No. 6,549,218 to Gershony et al. (“Gershony”). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Nevertheless, in the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejections, amendments have been made to independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 22 herein to clarify the claimed subject matter.

### The Claim Amendments

In the interest of expediting allowance of the subject application and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, amendments have been made to the independent claims herein. In particular, independent claims 1, 8, 17, and 22 have each been amended herein to clarify child window redirection techniques that include distinguishing between legacy windows and non-legacy windows. For example:

**Claim 1** as amended recites (portions of the amendment appear in bold/italics) a computer-executable method, comprising:

- arranging a parent window to contain a plurality of child windows;
- providing via the arranging enhanced functionality available to the parent window through a media integration layer (MIL) component to one or more legacy windows of the contained plurality of child windows that do not natively support the enhanced functionality by, for each of the plurality of child windows:
  - *determining whether the child window of the parent window is a*

*legacy window that does not natively support the enhanced functionality, or is an MIL-aware window that natively supports the enhanced functionality;*

○ *when the child window is a legacy window:*

- *causing* the child window output to be redirected to an off-screen buffer;
- *retrieving* the child window output from the off-screen buffer; and
- *applying* a visual enhancement to the child window output through the enhanced functionality available to the parent window; and

○ *when the child window is an MIL-aware window, rendering the child window directly through the MIL component;* and

- composing a visual representation of the parent window having the visually enhanced child window output corresponding to each child window determined to be a legacy window.

Claims 8, 17, 22 have each been amended to incorporate similar subject matter in varying terms and scope. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and drawings as filed. Particular attention is drawn to examples at FIG. 4 and p. 10, line 10 – p. 12 line 4. These examples describe using a MIL component of a parent window to provide enhanced functionality to legacy windows within the spirit of the amendments made to the independent claims.

As discussed in the interview on 7/23/08, Applicant submits that Gershony neither discloses nor suggests any such subject matter. As such, claims 1, 8, 17, and 22 and their associated dependent claims are not anticipated by Gershony and withdrawal of the §102 rejections is respectfully requested.

### Conclusion

The Application is in condition for allowance. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and issuance of the present application. Should any issue remain that prevents immediate issuance of the application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to discuss the unresolved issue.

Respectfully submitted,

/Christopher J. Culberson/

Date: August 14, 2008

By: reg. no. 59136, for Daniel T. McGinnity

Daniel T. McGinnity

Reg. No. 55444

Attorney for Applicant

Sadler, Breen, Morasch & Colby, PS

422 W. Riverside Avenue, Suite 424

Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: (509) 755-7257

Facsimile: (509) 755-7252